



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO.  | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.     | CONFIRMATION NO.       |
|--|-------------|----------------------|-------------------------|------------------------|
| 10/669,088   | 09/23/2003  | Udi Manber           | 121189                  | 1874                   |
| 26389 7590 05/02/2007<br>CHRISTENSEN, O'CONNOR, JOHNSON, KINDNESS, PLLC<br>1420 FIFTH AVENUE<br>SUITE 2800<br>SEATTLE, WA 98101-2347 |             |                      | EXAMINER<br>LE, MIRANDA |                        |
|  |             |                      | ART UNIT<br>2167        | PAPER NUMBER           |
|  |             |                      | MAIL DATE<br>05/02/2007 | DELIVERY MODE<br>PAPER |

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

|                              |                                      |                                   |  |
|------------------------------|--------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|--|
| <b>Office Action Summary</b> | <b>Application No.</b><br>10/669,088 | <b>Applicant(s)</b><br>UDI MANBER |  |
|                              | <b>Examiner</b><br>Miranda Le        | <b>Art Unit</b><br>2167           |  |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 April 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13, 15-33 and 35-47 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13, 15-33 and 35-47 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 23 September 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application                       |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>01/18/07</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114***

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 12/29/2006 has been entered.
2. This communication is responsive to Amendment, filed 04/04/2007.
3. Claims 1-13, 15-33, 35-47 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 24, 33 are independent claims. In the Amendment, claims 1, 24, 33 have been amended, claims 14, 34 have been cancelled. This action is made non-Final.

### ***Information Disclosure Statement***

4. Applicants' Information Disclosure Statement, filed 01/18/2007, has been received, entered into the record, and considered. See attached form PTO-1449.

### ***Specification***

5. The following is a quote in part of MPEP 608.01(p), concerning the incorporation of subject matter by reference:

"The Commissioner has considerable discretion in determining what may or may not be incorporated by reference in a patent application. *General Electric Co. v. Brenner*, 407 F.2d 1258, 159 USPQ 335 (D.C. Cir. 1968). The incorporation by reference practice with reference to applications which issue as U.S. patents provides the public with a patent disclosure which minimizes the public's burden to search for and obtain copies of documents incorporated by reference which may not be readily available. Through the Office's incorporation by reference policy the Office ensures that reasonably complete disclosures are

Art Unit: 2167

published as U.S. patents. The following is the manner in which the Commissioner has elected to exercise that discretion.

An application as filed must be complete in itself in order to comply with 35 U.S.C. 112. Material nevertheless may be incorporated by reference, *Ex parte Schwarze*, 151 USPQ 426 (Bd. App. 1966). An application for a patent when filed may incorporate "essential material" by reference to (1) a U.S. patent or (2) a pending U.S. application, subject to the conditions set forth below.

"Essential material" is defined as that which is necessary to (1) describe the claimed invention, (2) provide an enabling disclosure of the claimed invention, or (3) describe the best mode (35 U.S.C. 112). In any application which is to issue as a U.S. patent, essential material may not be incorporated by reference to (1) patents or applications published by foreign countries or a regional patent office, (2) non-patent publications, (3) a U.S. patent or application which itself incorporates "essential material" by reference, or (4) a foreign application.

Nonessential subject matter may be incorporated by reference to (1) patents or applications published by the United States or foreign countries or regional patent offices, (2) prior filed, commonly owned U.S. applications, or (3) non-patent publications. Nonessential subject matter is subject matter referred to for purposes of indicating the background of the invention or illustrating the state of the art.

Mere reference to another application, patent, or publication is not an incorporation of anything therein into the application containing such reference for the purpose of the disclosure required by 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph. *In re de Seversky*, 474 F.2d 671, 177 USPQ 144, (CCPA 1973). In addition to other requirements for an application, the referencing application should include an identification of the referenced patent, application, or publication. Particular attention should be directed to specific portions of the referenced document where the subject matter being incorporated may be found. Guidelines for situations where applicant is permitted to fill in a number for Serial No. \_\_\_\_\_ left blank in the application as filed can be found in *In re Fouche*, 439 F.2d 1237, 169 USPQ 429 (CCPA 1971) (Abandoned applications less than 20 years old can be incorporated by reference to same extent as copending applications; both types are open to public upon referencing application issuing as a patent)."

The disclosure on pp. 1 is objected to because a related application has no US Patent

Application Serial Numbers issued by the USPTO for the purpose of cross-referencing.

Appropriate correction is required.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person

having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

7. Claims 1-10, 18, 22-33, 38, 42-44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hartman et al. (US Patent No. 7,007,034), in view of Blumberg et al. (US Pub No. 20040205546).

**As to claim 1**, Hartman teaches a method for electronically searching a user-personalized library of content (*i.e. Client library 42 includes a client cache 40 used to locally hold copies of objects that have been stored to or retrieved from the object server 48 , col. 7, line 48-53*), comprising:

(a) receiving one or more search term from a user having an electronically-searchable personalized library of content (*i.e. allows users to locate documents by searching for words or phrases, abbreviations and acronyms, and proper names, col. 7, line 61 to col. 8, line 59; Figs. 11, 21A*), the personalized library including a text search database and a page image database (*i.e. all types of content including text, image, audio and video content, col. 5, lines 3-7; image object, col. 6, lines 44-56; Figs. 11, 21A*);

(b) electronically searching text searchable database for pages of content that match the search terms to produce search results (*i.e. the user may search the content by specifying search criteria through the interface, col. 2, lines 43-60; Figs. 11, 21A*);

(d) providing the search results to the user (*Fig. 21B*);

(c) receiving a search result selection from a user (*i.e. As the user selects desired objects for inclusion in a compilation, the system arranges the objects hierarchically, e.g., into volumes, chapters and sections according to the order specified by the user, col. 3, lines 1-8; Figs. 11, 21A*); and

(e) providing to the user an image of a page of content in the page image database (*i.e. all types of content including text, image, audio and video content, col. 5, lines 3-7; image object, col. 6, lines 44-56; Figs. 11, 21A*) based on the user's search result selection (*i.e. the user may search the content by specifying search criteria through the interface, col. 2, lines 43-60; Figs. 11, 21A*).

Hartman does not specifically teach:

(e) wherein prior to providing the image of the page of content to the user, the appearance of the image is modified in accordance with one or more access rules to limit an amount of content in the image, such that only a portion of the image of the page of content is viewable by the user when image is displayed.

Blumberg teaches:

(e) prior to providing the image of the page of content to the user, the appearance of the image is modified (*i.e. the image server transmits image data used to generate a portion of an image at a specific resolution, [0009]*) in accordance with one or more access rules to limit an amount of content in the image (*i.e. a portion of an image, [0009]*); extracting at least one image from the document, [0020]), such that only a portion of the image of the page of content is viewable by the user when image is displayed (*i.e. The composing tool is used for displaying document pages, or portions of document pages, [0016]*); Specifically, the image

*server transmits image data used to generate a portion of an image at a specific resolution, necessary to display a portion of a page at a specific resolution requested by a customer. As the customer requests to see different portions of the page at different resolutions, the image server transmits additional image data as needed, [0009]).*

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill of the art having the teaching of Hartman and Blumberg at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Hartman to include step (e) as taught by Blumberg.

One of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to make this combination in order to view a portion of a page in size to accommodate any viewing resolution in view of Blumberg ([0134]), as doing so would give the added benefit of having the scalable document enlarged or reduced to any desired resolution, making the entire document scalable--text characters, graphical objects and raster images as taught by Blumberg ([0010]).

**As per claim 24**, Hartman teaches a method for preparing a user-personalized library of content for electronic searching and delivery of content to a user (*i.e. Client library 42 includes a client cache 40 used to locally hold copies of objects that have been stored to or retrieved from the object server 48, col. 7, line 48-53*), comprising:

(a) acquiring a general library of content (*i.e. allows users to locate documents by searching for words or phrases, abbreviations and acronyms, and proper names, col. 7, line 61 to col. 8, line 59; Figs. 11, 21A*) that includes images and corresponding text of pages of content (*i.e. all types of content including text, image, audio and video content, col. 5, lines 3-7; image object, col. 6, lines 44-56; Figs. 11, 21A*);

(b) preparing a page image database (*i.e. all types of content including text, image, audio and video content, col. 5, lines 3-7; image object, col. 6, lines 44-56; Figs. 11, 21A*) comprised of the images of pages content (*i.e. the user may search the content by specifying search criteria through the interface, col. 2, lines 43-60; Figs. 11, 21A*);

(c) preparing a text searchable database comprised of the corresponding text of pages of content (*Fig. 21B*);

(d) receiving from a user a selection of content in the general library to form a user-personalized library of content that the user can electronically search using the text searchable database (*i.e. As the user selects desired objects for inclusion in a compilation, the system arranges the objects hierarchically, e.g., into volumes, chapters and sections according to the order specified by the user, col. 3, lines 1-8; Figs. 11, 21A*);

(e) identifying an image of a page of content in the page image database (*i.e. all types of content including text, image, audio and video content, col. 5, lines 3-7; image object, col. 6, lines 44-56; Figs. 11, 21A*) based on a search of the text searchable database (*i.e. the user may search the content by specifying search criteria through the interface, col. 2, lines 43-60; Figs. 11, 21A*).

Hartman does not specifically teach:

(f) modifying the appearance of the image of the page of content in accordance with one or more access rules to limit an amount of content in the image, wherein only a portion of the image of the page of content is viewable by the user when the image is displayed.

Blumberg teaches:



(f) modifying the appearance of the image (*i.e. the image server transmits image data used to generate a portion of an image at a specific resolution, [0009]*) of the page of content in accordance with one or more access rules to limit an amount of content in the image (*i.e. The composing tool is used for displaying document pages, or portions of document pages, [0016]*), wherein only a portion of the image of the page of content is viewable by the user when the image is displayed (*i.e. Specifically, the image server transmits image data used to generate a portion of an image at a specific resolution, necessary to display a portion of a page at a specific resolution requested by a customer. As the customer requests to see different portions of the page at different resolutions, the image server transmits additional image data as needed, [0009]*).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill of the art having the teaching of Hartman and Blumberg at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Hartman to include step (f) as taught by Blumberg.

One of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to make this combination in order to view a portion of a page in size to accommodate any viewing resolution in view of Blumberg (*[0134]*), as doing so would give the added benefit of having the scalable document enlarged or reduced to any desired resolution, making the entire document scalable--text characters, graphical objects and raster images as taught by Blumberg (*[0010]*).

**As per claim 33**, Hartman teaches a computer system that provides electronic searching of a user-personalized library of content (*i.e. Client library 42 includes a client cache 40 used to locally hold copies of objects that have been stored to or retrieved from the object server 48*,

Art Unit: 2167

col. 7, line 48-53), comprising a search server in communication with a database server (Figs. 1-3), in which the database server is configured with a general library of content that is accessible to multiple users, the general library including

(1) a page image database containing images of pages of content (*i.e. all types of content including text, image, audio and video content, col. 5, lines 3-7; image object, col. 6, lines 44-56; Figs. 11, 21A*),

(2) an access rights database containing access rules that define the scope of content to be displayed to each user (*i.e. A web-based user interface is provided for presenting a user with a plurality of selectable objects, each object representing a subset of the hierarchical data (e.g., chapter subsections, musical excerpts, video excerpts, etc.). The plurality of objects may represent all subsets of the stored content or less than all of the subsets (e.g., categorizing the content and by providing a bookshelf for each category that a user may browse, col. 2, lines 43-60*), and

(3) a text searchable database containing text and identifying information indication the page images in the page image database that contain the text (*i.e. an image stored in a TIFF format, col. 7, lines 12-15; allows users to locate documents by searching for words or phrases, abbreviations and acronyms, and proper names, col. 7, line 61 to col. 8, line 59; Figs. 11, 21A*), the search server being configured with a search engine comprised of computer-implemented instructions that enable the search server to:

(a) receive one or more search terms from a user having established a personalized library within the general library of content (*i.e. the user may search the content by specifying search criteria through the interface, col. 2, lines 43-60; Figs. 11, 21A*),

(b) search the full text of the user's personalized library for pages of content that match the search terms (*i.e. all types of content including text, image, audio and video content, col. 5, lines 3-7; image object, col. 6, lines 44-56; Figs. 11, 21A*),

(c) provide the results of the full text search to the user for selection by the user (*i.e. As the user selects desired objects for inclusion in a compilation, the system arranges the objects hierarchically, e.g., into volumes, chapters and sections according to the order specified by the user, col. 3, lines 1-8; Figs. 11, 21A*); and

Hartman does not explicitly teach:

(d) provide to the user a page image from the page image database on the user's search result selection, the content in the page image being provided within the scope defined by the access rules, wherein the scope defined by the access rules defines an amount of content in the page image that is viewable by the user when the page image is displayed.

Blumberg teaches:

(d) provide to the user a page image from the page image database (*i.e. image server, Fig. 3*) on the user's search result selection, the content in the page image being provided within the scope defined by the access rules (*i.e. the image server transmits image data used to generate a portion of an image at a specific resolution, [0009]*), wherein the scope defined by the access rules defines an amount of content in the page image (*i.e. a portion of an image, [0009]; extracting at least one image from the document, [0020]*) that is viewable by the user (*i.e. The composing tool is used for displaying document pages, or portions of document pages, [0016]*) when the page image is displayed (*i.e. Specifically, the image server transmits image data used to generate a portion of an image at a specific resolution, necessary to display a*

*portion of a page at a specific resolution requested by a customer. As the customer requests to see different portions of the page at different resolutions, the image server transmits additional image data as needed, [0009]).*

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill of the art having the teaching of Hartman and Blumberg at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Hartman to include step (d) as taught by Blumberg.

One of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to make this combination in order to view a portion of a page in size to accommodate any viewing resolution in view of Blumberg ([0134]), as doing so would give the added benefit of having the scalable document enlarged or reduced to any desired resolution, making the entire document scalable--text characters, graphical objects and raster images as taught by Blumberg ([0010]).

**As per claim 2**, Hartman teaches prior to receiving one or more search terms for the user, establishing an electronically-searchable library of content that is personalized by the user to consist of content selected by the user (*see My Book outline, Fig. 16*).

**As per claim 3**, Hartman teaches the library of content is personalized by manual selection of content by the user (*i.e. The user then selects one or more of the objects for inclusion in a compilation (e.g., a custom textbook). Alternatively, the user may search the content by specifying search criteria through the interface. Additionally, the user may create new content, e.g., a new chapter or section, for inclusion in the final compilation by inputting user-provided*

*material through the web interface. The system preferably stores the new content and creates a reusable, selectable object associated with the new content, col. 2, lines 43-60).*

**As per claim 4**, Hartman teaches the library of content is automatically personalized based on user selection of content for review or purchase (*i.e. Additionally, the user may create new content, e.g., a new chapter or section, for inclusion in the final compilation by inputting user-provided material through the web interface. The system preferably stores the new content and creates a reusable, selectable object associated with the new content, col. 2, lines 43-60).*

**As per claim 5**, Hartman teaches the user-personalized library of content is establish at the time the user conducts the search (*i.e. The user then selects one or more of the objects for inclusion in a compilation (e.g., a custom textbook). Alternatively, the user may search the content by specifying search criteria through the interface. Additionally, the user may create new content, e.g., a new chapter or section, for inclusion in the final compilation by inputting user-provided material through the web interface. The system preferably stores the new content and creates a reusable, selectable object associated with the new content, col. 2, lines 43-60).*

**As per claim 6**, Hartman teaches the user's personalized library of content is derived from a publicly-accessible general library of content (*i.e. a digital library, col. 2, lines 43-60).*

**As per claim 7**, Hartman teaches providing the search results to the user includes providing a list of content having pages with text that matches the search terms (*i.e. the*

*hierarchical structure of the data may include book containers, volume containers, chapter containers, and subsections, col. 2, lines 24-42).*

**As per claim 8**, Hartman teaches ranking the content in the list of content according to a predetermined criterion (*i.e. Rank: 24, col. 83, lines 45-50*).

**As per claim 9**, Hartman teaches providing to the user an image of a page of content includes retrieving the page image form a database of page image stored in computer memory (*i.e. library server and library client, ... a personal computer, ... host processor, col. 5, line 6 to col. 6, line 11*).

**As per claim 10**, Hartman teaches the user's personalized library is defined after electronically searching a general library of content using the search terms, the user's personalized library being fully contained within the general library of content and defining the scope of search results provided to the user (*i.e. The user then selects one or more of the objects for inclusion in a compilation (e.g., a custom textbook). Alternatively, the user may search the content by specifying search criteria through the interface. Additionally, the user may create new content, e.g., a new chapter or section, for inclusion in the final compilation by inputting user-provided material through the web interface. The system preferably stores the new content and creates a reusable, selectable object associated with the new content, col. 2, lines 43-60*).

As to claims 18, 38, Hartman teaches the access rules define the amount of content that can be provided to the user based on user ownership of the content (*i.e. The "Temporal Restriction", "Effective Start Date" and "Effective Termination Date" columns define a time context for the requiring rule. A time context states for the rule to either apply only during a specified time period or not to apply at all during the specific time period. The "Effective Start Date" and "Effective Termination Date" columns define the start and terminate dates for a rule. The "Temporal Restriction" column can contain two values: "includes" and "excludes". If the value is "includes", the rule is to be applied only during the time period outlined by the "Effective Start Date" and "Effective Termination Date" columns. If the value is "excludes", the rule is not to be applied during the time period outlined in these columns, col. 68, lines 45-57).*

As to claims 22, 42, Hartman teaches the access rules define the amount of content that can be provided to the user based on an identification of the user (*i.e. The user then selects one or more of the objects for inclusion in a compilation (e.g., a custom textbook). Alternatively, the user may search the content by specifying search criteria through the interface. Additionally, the user may create new content, e.g., a new chapter or section, for inclusion in the final compilation by inputting user-provided material through the web interface. The system preferably stores the new content and creates a reusable, selectable object associated with the new content, col. 2, lines 43-60).*

As to claims 23, 43, Hartman teaches a non-text object in the user's personalized library is made searchable by including text data to the object in the electronic search (*i.e. The user then*

*selects one or more of the objects for inclusion in a compilation (e.g., a custom textbook). Alternatively, the user may search the content by specifying search criteria through the interface. Additionally, the user may create new content, e.g., a new chapter or section, for inclusion in the final compilation by inputting user-provided material through the web interface. The system preferably stores the new content and creates a reusable, selectable object associated with the new content, col. 2, lines 43-60).*

**As per claim 44**, Hartman teaches the search server provides the search results in the form of a list of content having pages with text that matches the search terms, which content in the list of content is ranked according to a predetermined criterion (*i.e. Rank: 24, col. 83, lines 45-50*).

**As per claim 25**, Hartman teaches defining classes of content and assigning content in the user's personalized library to one or more of the classes (*i.e. Additionally, the user may create new content, e.g., a new chapter or section, for inclusion in the final compilation by inputting user-provided material through the web interface. The system preferably stores the new content and creates a reusable, selectable object associated with the new content, col. 2, lines 43-60*).

**As per claim 26**, Hartman teaches limiting a search of the user's personalized library to content in a specified class (*i.e. Additionally, the user may create new content, e.g., a new chapter or section, for inclusion in the final compilation by inputting user-provided material*



*through the web interface. The system preferably stores the new content and creates a reusable, selectable object associated with the new content, col. 2, lines 43-60).*

**As per claim 27**, Hartman teaches the personalized library of content is comprised of content selected by a group of persons constituting a user, the method further comprising enabling persons in the group to conduct searches of the personalized library of content (*i.e. university professors, col. 4, lines 58-63*).

**As per claim 28**, Hartman teaches the user's selection of content in the general library is received based on manual selection by the user (*i.e. The user then selects one or more of the objects for inclusion in a compilation (e.g., a custom textbook). Alternatively, the user may search the content by specifying search criteria through the interface. Additionally, the user may create new content, e.g., a new chapter or section, for inclusion in the final compilation by inputting user-provided material through the web interface. The system preferably stores the new content and creates a reusable, selectable object associated with the new content, col. 2, lines 43-60*).

**As per claim 29**, Hartman teaches the user's selection of content in the general library is automatically received based on a selection of content by the user for review or purchase (*i.e. Additionally, the user may create new content, e.g., a new chapter or section, for inclusion in the final compilation by inputting user-provided material through the web interface. The system*

*preferably stores the new content and creates a reusable, selectable object associated with the new content, col. 2, lines 43-60).*

**As per claim 30**, Hartman teaches storing the user-personalized library of content in a memory for later retrieval by the user (*i.e. The user then selects one or more of the objects for inclusion in a compilation (e.g., a custom textbook). Alternatively, the user may search the content by specifying search criteria through the interface. Additionally, the user may create new content, e.g., a new chapter or section, for inclusion in the final compilation by inputting user-provided material through the web interface. The system preferably stores the new content and creates a reusable, selectable object associated with the new content, col. 2, lines 43-60).*

**As per claim 31**, Hartman teaches enabling the user to store and retrieve multiple user-personalized libraries (*i.e. university professors, col. 4, lines 58-63).*

**As per claim 32**, Hartman teaches the user's selection of content in the general library is aided by providing the user with a list of content determined to be related to a subject content (*i.e. SEARCH CONTENTS, Fig. 21B).*

8. Claims 11-13, 15, 17, 20, 21, 35, 37, 40, 41, 45-47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hartman et al. (US Patent No. 7,007,034), in view of Blumberg et al. (US Pub No. 20040205546), and further in view of Milic-Frayling et al. (US Patent No. 6,968,332).

As to claims 11, 45, Hartman, Blumberg do not explicitly teach providing location information to the user that identifies the location of the search terms in the page image; and instructing an electronic application of highlight to the page image by the user in accordance with the location information to highlight the search terms in the page image.

Milic-Frayling teaches:

providing location information to the user that identifies the location of the search terms in the page image (*i.e. information highlighting facility, col. 8, lines 13-20*);

instructing an electronic application of highlight to the page image by the user in accordance with the location information to highlight the search terms in the page image (*i.e. the user may prefer to have terminology from the original description of the information need highlight in one color while all the synonyms in some other color, col. 8, lines 32-44*).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill of the art having the teaching of Hartman, Blumberg, and Milic-Frayling at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Hartman, Blumberg to include the limitations as taught by Milic-Frayling.

One of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to make this combination in order to assist a user in reading and assessing the documents in view of Milic-Frayling (*col. 3, lines 18-34*), as doing so would give the added benefit of satisfying a further need to provide a rich representation of the user's information need as taught by Milic-Frayling (*col. 2, lines 23-34*).

As to claims 12, 46, Hartman, Blumberg do not explicitly teach the electronic application of highlight to the page image comprises application of a layer of color on or near the search terms.

Milic-Frayling teaches the electronic application of highlight to the page image comprises application of a layer of color on or near the search terms (*i.e. the user may prefer to have terminology from the original description of the information need highlight in one color while all the synonyms in some other color, col. 8, lines 32-44*).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill of the art having the teaching of Hartman, Blumberg, and Milic-Frayling at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Hartman, Blumberg to include the electronic application of highlight to the page image comprises application of a layer of color on or near the search terms as taught by Milic-Frayling.

One of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to make this combination in order to assist a user in reading and assessing the documents in view of Milic-Frayling (*col. 3, lines 18-34*), as doing so would give the added benefit of satisfying a further need to provide a rich representation of the user's information need as taught by Milic-Frayling (*col. 2, lines 23-34*).

**As to claims 13, 47,** Hartman, Blumberg do not explicitly teach the electronic application of highlight to the page image comprises placement of a visual indicator next to the search terms.

Milic-Frayling teaches the electronic application of highlight to the page image comprises placement of a visual indicator next to the search terms (*i.e. the user may prefer to have terminology from the original description of the information need highlight in one color while all the synonyms in some other color, col. 8, lines 32-44*).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill of the art having the teaching of Hartman, Blumberg, and Milic-Frayling at the time the invention was made to modify the system

Art Unit: 2167

of Hartman, Blumberg to include the electronic application of highlight to the page image comprises placement of a visual indicator next to the search terms as taught by Milic-Frayling.

One of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to make this combination in order to assist a user in reading and assessing the documents in view of Milic-Frayling (*col. 3, lines 18-34*), as doing so would give the added benefit of satisfying a further need to provide a rich representation of the user's information need as taught by Milic-Frayling (*col. 2, lines 23-34*).

As to **claims 15, 35**, Hartman, Blumberg do not fairly teach the access rules define an aggregate amount of content that can be provided to the user over a time frame.

Milic-Frayling teaches the access rules define an aggregate amount of content that can be provided to the user over a time frame (*i.e. a certain period of time, col. 9, lines 10-16*).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill of the art having the teaching of Hartman, Blumberg, and Milic-Frayling at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Hartman, Blumberg to include the access rules define an aggregate amount of content that can be provided to the user over a time frame as taught by Milic-Frayling.

One of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to make this combination in order to store some types of analysis of documents that have been performed as a result of the users' requests within a certain period of time in view of Milic-Frayling (*col. 9, lines 10-16*), as doing so would give the added benefit of satisfying a further need to provide a rich representation of the user's information need as taught by Milic-Frayling (*col. 2, lines 23-34*).

As to claims 17, 37, Hartman, Blumberg do not specifically teach the access rules define the amount of content that can be provided to the user based on content-specific information.

Milic-Frayling teaches the access rules define the amount of content that can be provided to the user based on content-specific information (*i.e. specified features ... company names, person names, location names, col. 2, line 53 to col. 3, line 17*).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill of the art having the teaching of Hartman, Blumberg, and Milic-Frayling at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Hartman, Blumberg to include the access rules define the amount of content that can be provided to the user based on content-specific information as taught by Milic-Frayling.

One of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to make this combination in order to analyze the document text to the user's specified information need in view of Milic-Frayling (*col. 9, lines 10-16*), as doing so would give the added benefit of satisfying a further need to provide a rich representation of the user's information need as taught by Milic-Frayling (*col. 2, lines 23-34*).

As to claims 20, 40, Hartman, Blumberg do not explicitly teach different access rules apply based on the location of the user.

Milic-Frayling teaches different access rules apply based on the location of the user (*i.e. user's specified information, col. 2, line 53 to col. 3, line 17*).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill of the art having the teaching of Hartman, Blumberg, and Milic-Frayling at the time the invention was made to modify the system

Art Unit: 2167

of Hartman, Blumberg to include different access rules apply based on the location of the user as taught by Milic-Frayling.

One of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to make this combination in order to analyze the document text to the user's specified information need in view of Milic-Frayling (*col. 9, lines 10-16*), as doing so would give the added benefit of satisfying a further need to provide a rich representation of the user's information need as taught by Milic-Frayling (*col. 2, lines 23-34*).

**As to claims 21, 41,** Hartman, Blumberg do not expressly teach different access rules apply based on the time the content is to be provided to the user.

Milic-Frayling teaches different access rules apply based on the time the content is to be provided to the user (*i.e. a certain period of time, col. 9, lines 10-16*).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill of the art having the teaching of Hartman, Blumberg, and Milic-Frayling at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Hartman, Blumberg to include different access rules apply based on the time the content is to be provided to the user as taught by Milic-Frayling.

One of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to make this combination in order to store some types of analysis of documents that have been performed as a result of the users' requests within a certain period of time in view of Milic-Frayling (*col. 9, lines 10-16*), as doing so would give the added benefit of satisfying a further need to provide a rich representation of the user's information need as taught by Milic-Frayling (*col. 2, lines 23-34*).

9. Claims 19, 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hartman et al. (US Patent No. 7,007,034), in view of Blumberg et al. (US Pub No. 20040205546), and further in view of Ishibashi et al. (US Pub No. 20010007980).

**As per claim 19**, Hartman and Blumberg do not specifically teach reviewing purchase records to validate user ownership of the content.

However, Ishibashi teaches reviewing purchase records to validate user ownership of the content *(i.e. a bookshelf server 3 that temporarily deposits the title and the contents of a book purchased by a user and a personal information management server 4 that manages the personal information of the user that purchased the electronic book are provided to the service provider 1, [0058-0061])*.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill of the art having the teaching of Hartman, Blumberg and Ishibashi at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Hartman and Blumberg to include reviewing purchase records to validate user ownership of the content as taught by Ishibashi.

One of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to make this combination in order to provide the information to a user in view of Ishibashi, as doing so would give the added benefit of enabling a user to easily select a necessary book in much book information, to read a book of some interest owing to various stage effects and to purchase these books at a low price as taught by Ishibashi *([0061])*.



As per claim 39, Hartman and Blumberg do not specifically teach the computer-implemented instructions further enable the server to validate user ownership of the content by reviewing purchase records pertaining to the user.

However, Ishibashi teaches the computer-implemented instructions further enable the server to validate user ownership of the content by reviewing purchase records pertaining to the user (*i.e. a bookshelf server 3 that temporarily deposits the title and the contents of a book purchased by a user and a personal information management server 4 that manages the personal information of the user that purchased the electronic book are provided to the service provider 1, [0058-0061]*).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill of the art having the teaching of Hartman, Blumberg and Ishibashi at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Hartman and Blumberg to include the computer-implemented instructions further enable the server to validate user ownership of the content by reviewing purchase records pertaining to the user as taught by Ishibashi.

One of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to make this combination in order to provide the information to a user in view of Ishibashi, as doing so would give the added benefit of enabling a user to easily select a necessary book in much book information, to read a book of some interest owing to various stage effects and to purchase these books at a low price as taught by Ishibashi (*[0061]*).

10. Claims 16, 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hartman et al. (US Patent No. 7,007,034), in view of Blumberg et al. (US Pub No. 20040205546), and further in view of McCollom et al. (US Patent No. 6,925,444).

As to claims 16, 36, Hartman teaches the access rules define a percentage of content that can be provided to the user over a time frame (*col. 94, lines 17-19*).

Hartman and Blumberg, however, do not fairly teach the access rules define a percentage of content that can be provided to the user over a time frame.

McCollom teaches the access rules define a percentage of content that can be provided to the user over a time frame (*i.e. 75% ... 10%, col. 9, lines 9-34*).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill of the art having the teaching of Hartman, Blumberg and McCollom at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Hartman and Blumberg to include the access rules define a percentage of content that can be provided to the user over a time frame as taught by McCollom.

One of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to make this combination in order to generate a specific report requested and present the report as a HTML document to the merchant website in view of McCollom (*col. 8, line 65 to col. 9, line 8*), as doing so would give the added benefit of having the customer system kept current purchasing lists available so that other second party customers receive only the latest purchasing lists from particular customer as taught by McCollom (*col. 2, lines 44-47*).

### ***Response to Arguments***

11. With respect to claims 1-13, 15, 17, 18, 20-23, Applicant's arguments regarding neither Hartman nor Milic-Frayling teaches or suggests providing to the user an image of a page of content "wherein prior to providing the image of the page of content to the user, the appearance of the image is modified in accordance with one or more access rules to limit an amount of content in the image, such that only a portion of the image of the page of content is viewable by the user when the image is displayed" as amended in claim 1 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

With respect to claims 24-32, applicant's arguments regarding Lee neither teaches nor suggests providing to the user an image of a page of content " modifying the appearance of the image of the page of content in accordance with one or more access rules to limit an amount of content in the image, wherein only a portion of the image of the page of content is viewable by the user when the image is displayed" as amended in claim 24 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

With respect to claims 33, 35, 37, 38, 40-47, applicant's arguments regarding neither Hartman nor Milic-Frayling teaches or suggests "provide to the user a page image from the page image database based on the user's search result selection, the content in the page image being provided within the scope defined by the access rules, wherein the scope defined by the access rules defines an amount of content in the page image that is viewable by the user when the page image is displayed" as amended in claim 33 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

With respect to claims 16, 36, applicant's arguments regarding claims 16, 36 are patentable over Hartman, Miic-Frayling and McCollom for the reasons described in regard to

Art Unit: 2167

newly amended claims 1, 33 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

With respect to claims 19, 39, applicant's arguments regarding claims 16, 36 are patentable over Hartman, Milic-Frayling and Ishibashi for the reasons described in regard to newly amended claims 1, 33 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Accordingly, the claimed invention as represented in the claims does not represent a patentable over the art of record.

### *Conclusion*

12. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Miranda Le whose telephone number is (571) 272-4112. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:30 AM to 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John R. Cottingham, can be reached on (571) 272-7079. The fax number to this Art Unit is 571-273-8300.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Miranda Le  
April 27, 2007